

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 10-28, and 30-45 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 10-28, and 30-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious from Knee et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,589,892 ("Knee") in view of West et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,550,575 ("West").

Summary of the Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended claims 1, 21, 24, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 39 to more particularly define the claimed invention. The amendments do not add any new matter and are fully supported by the originally-filed application.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' Reply to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 10-28, and 30-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious from Knee in view of West. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentable over Knee and West at least because Applicants' claimed invention allows the selection of one or more programs based on titles of the programs for access by a user and permits only the selected programs to be accessed to the exclusion of all other programs in a second mode of operation, as required by independent claims 1, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 39.

Knee discloses a program guide system that allows a user to define channel presentation preferences. In particular, Knee describes a user-defined channel preference list created by "select[ing] a particular list of channels" and limiting the tuning of a television receiver to only those channels (see Knee, col. 27:55 - col. 28:5). This is not the same as Applicants' claimed approach which allows a user to enter a master mode and select programs based on titles of the programs for access and permits access to only these programs in a mode of operation different from master mode. In contrast to Knee, Applicants' claimed invention allows a user to select individual programs by title for access, to the exclusion of all programs not selected, and thus provides the user with an improved parental control that allows a user to exercise more fine-grained control over access. For example, Applicants' claimed invention affords a user the ability to select a first program for access while not selecting, and therefore excluding from access, a second program on the same channel as the first program. Disclosure cannot be found in Knee of allowing a user to select individual programs and exercise this fine-grained control.

West was cited by the Examiner as allegedly showing other features of Applicants' claims and does not make up for the deficiencies of Knee. West describes a time monitoring routine that allows a user to enter times of day when viewing is prohibited and time limits for the amount of television a particular user may watch (see West col. 13:51 - col. 14:6). West does not, however, allow a user to select one of more programs based on titles of programs for access to the

exclusion of all other programs. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that combining Knee with West will not result in Applicants' claimed approach.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 39 and, by extension, their dependent claims 10-26, 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, and 40-45 are patentable over the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claims 1, 10-28, and 30-45 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
/Gall C. Gotfried/

Gall C. Gotfried
Reg. No. 58,333
Attorney for Applicants
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 75563